



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/086,294	05/28/1998	PEGGY M. STUMER	98-P-7528-US	8062
7590	02/27/2004		EXAMINER	
SIEMENS CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 186 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830			AGDEPPA, HECTOR A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2642	31
DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/086,294	STUMER, PEGGY M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hector A. Agdeppa	2642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2642

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on 12/3/03. Claims 1 - 19 are now pending in the present application. **This action is made final.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1 – 6 and 8 - 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Pat 5,915,008 (Dulman).

Regarding claims 1 – 5 and 9, Dulman teaches a system and method for provisioning and accessing AIN services such as call transfer, routing, or redirection. Dulman accomplishes such via either a mediating ISCP 22 that mediates queries and responses and/or an access server 48 that receives service requests, as an intermediary server to the service-providing node or element, and decodes/translates any necessary data/info in or from the service request to decide which node or element will handle the service request. Dulman teaches a broader, general overview of the aspects of the claimed invention. The following secondary references are used as specific and concrete examples of features and apparatuses that while not specifically discussed in Dulman, are at least obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was created, to have included in the invention of Dulman. (Abstract, Figs. 1, 2, and 5A – 5C, Col. 4, line 28 – Col. 5, line 14, Col. 6, line 60 – Col. 16, line 45. of Dulman)

ISCP 22 may also be read as the claimed intervening server and original server that determines whether execution of supplementary service requests is carried out by itself or by another of a plurality of SCPs/servers such as SCP 28. Dulman teaches that all requests are routed through ISCP 22 which may process the call itself or if required go to another SCP, such as SCP 28 to obtain the information needed to process the call. Specifically, ISCP 22 processes the instructions from an alternate carrier's SCP, which in effect is processing by another server. (Col. 9, lines 25 – 55 of Dulman) Also, Dulman teaches that the network may have more than one ISCP and if a first element is backlogged, another SCP may be used to service a call or request. (Col. 15, lines 22 – 33) Because all calls/requests will go through ISCP 22 first, it is analogous to an intervening server, and as already discussed, it determines whether or not to process a call/request itself or go to another SCP/server, which of course would be different from ISCP 22, i.e., the original server.

Furthermore, Dulman teaches link optimization in the form of considering how to route calls/requests/data information according to least used and least cost routes. The decision to route calls and requests using least used or least cost routes or even preferred routes, are based on customer's preferences, or optimization considerations taken into account when trying to effect a service or complete a call. (Col. 15, lines 5 – 20)

As to claim 6, both Dulman via the use of schedules, Col. 18, lines 11 – 16, allow various services to be activated/deactivated.

As to claims 8 and 10 – 12, see above-mentioned sections of Dulman which teach the use of optimization parameters such as timing or least cost routes, as well as predetermined conditions whether it be via direct customer input or via schedules or other predetermined means, wherein services may be enabled/disable and resources/elements/nodes are accessed or not accessed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat 5,915,008 (Dulman).

As to claim 7, such is inherent or at the very least obvious for one skilled in the art to implement as most system will recalls or behave accordingly when a service fails in that usually, it is not desirable for system resources to be tied up indefinitely which would be the case, if a failed service request were to be tried and re-tried over and over again – hence the need for some sort of recall. Moreover, Dulman teaches that an error message may be sent to a customer or alternative rerouting is performed for a customer when there is a system failure or when an SCP, for example, is unavailable. (Col. 15, lines 1 – 9)

4. Claims 13 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat 5,915,008 (Dulman) in view of US Pat 5,999,610 (Lin et al.)

As to claims 13 and 17, Dulman has been discussed above.

The standard operation of intelligent networks involves the detection of triggers which invoke call suspension and a switch/SSP communicating with an associated SCP(s) to obtain further call processing instructions for a call when anything other than standard call routing is needed. Such triggers read on the claimed supplement service signals.

What Dulman does not teach is a list of one or more servers' addresses, listed in order of redirection priority.

However, Lin et al. teach a system wherein multiple SCPs are used and depending on instructions stored in tables or databases, SCPs may be queried/accessed for call processing either simultaneously or in some predetermined order. (Figs. 2 – 16, Col. 2, line 63 – Col. 3, line 14, Col. 5, lines 9 – 34, Col. 10, line 37 – Col. 15, line 30, Col. 18, line 1 – Col. 19, line 13, Col. 23, line 15 – Col. 24, line 52, Col. 29, lines 27 – 35, Col. 32, lines 26 – 33, Col. 33, line 58 – Col. 46, lin3 55 of Lin et al.)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the Dulman and Lin et al. inasmuch as both Dulman and Lin et al. teach the use of multiple SCPs to service/handle supplementary services and Lin et al. merely introduces a different method of dealing with multiple SCPs.

As to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 6. Waking a service is equivalent to activating it at a certain time, dependent for example, as taught by Dulman, a customer's schedule.

As to claims 16, see the rejection of claims 1 and 6.

As to claim 18, the functionality of a control system at every server interface is included in any SCP. The SCP of any intelligent network controls call processing and moreover, the SCP must be able to communicate with all intelligent network elements as well as elements such as an access server or various elements such as billing and data collector or intelligent peripherals as taught above by Dulman.

As to claim 19, a primary rate interface is merely the ISDN equivalent of a T1 line and T1 lines are the standard communications line used in digital communications. A basic rate interface is merely the other interface in ISDN. Whatever types of communication lines are chosen, these claimed are standard and at the least would have been an obvious choice for one of ordinary skill in the art to use inasmuch as they are the standard communication lines used in ISDNs.

Moreover, Dulman teaches contemplating the use of ISDN networks in the system. (Col. 10, line 44 – Col. 12, line 55 of Dulman)

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 12/3/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to applicant's arguments regarding claims 1 – 12, note that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Also, applicant's arguments have been addressed in the above rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hector A. Agdeppa whose telephone number is 703-305-1844. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon thru Fri 9:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on 703-305-4731. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

H.A.A.
February 22, 2004



AHMAD F. MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700